



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,902	01/17/2002	Stephen M. Allen	BB-1163 US DIV	3372
23906	7590	08/31/2005	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			ROBINSON, HOPE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
DATE MAILED: 08/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/051,902	ALLEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Hope A. Robinson	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)<br>3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .<br>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)<br>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |
|--|--|

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Application Status***

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1656.
  
2. The Notice of Allowability was withdrawn on August 3, 2005 and prosecution has been re-opened in favor of the below Office Action.

***Claim Disposition***

3. Claims 1-15 and 24-31 have been cancelled. Claims 16-23 are pending and are under examination.

***Claim Objection***

4. Claims 16-18 are objected to because of the following informalities:  
For clarity and precision of claim language, claim 16(a) should be amended to recite "a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having sugar transport protein activity, wherein said polypeptide is at least...", in lieu of "a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having sugar transport protein activity, wherein the amino acid sequence of the polypeptide and the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:20 have at least...". See also claims 17-18.

Correction of the above is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 16 and the dependent claims hereto are directed to an isolated nucleic acid fragment comprising a nucleotide sequence encoding a polypeptide having sugar transport activity, wherein the amino acid sequence is at least 66% identical to SEQ ID NO:20, for example. The claims encompass a genus of polypeptides, which are highly variable and which are not adequately described and the specification does not demonstrate retention of function for the fragments to demonstrate possession of the genus of the claimed invention. An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. See *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Further, the specification on page 4 state that SEQ ID NO:20 is the deduced amino acid sequence of a portion of a *Beta vulgaris*-like

sugar transport protein derived from the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO:19. There is no indicia as to where in the sequence the modifications are to take place or what composition of amino acids the sequence will comprise following modification. A skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the claimed polypeptide based on the variability contemplated.

Furthermore, the specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. As such, neither the description of the structure and function of SEQ ID NO: 20, for example, "66% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:20 and is a sugar transport protein" is sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991)*, states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or

she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of encoded proteins, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993). See MPEP 2163.

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

6. Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide set forth in (SEQ ID NO:20), does not reasonably provide enablement for any fragments thereof. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to:

I. Quantity of Experimentation Necessary:

The claimed invention is directed to a nucleic acid fragment encoding a polypeptide having sugar transport activity wherein said polypeptide is 66% or 90% or 95 identical to SEQ

ID NO:20. The instant application does not provide domains that are to be conserved or demonstrate retention of function in the claimed fragments. The art recognizes that the structure-function relationship of a peptide can be dramatically affected by structural changes. A skilled artisan would have to engage in undue experimentation to be able to construct the polypeptides as claimed and test same for biological activity. Neither the claims nor the specification provides any showing of the claimed fragments in association with the claimed invention to enable one skilled in the art to be able to practice the full scope of the claimed invention, without undue experimentation.

II. Amount of direction or guidance presented:

The specification does not provide adequate guidance to be able to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. No guidance is provided as to conserved regions in the polypeptide or whether the structure can tolerate modifications. To examine every fragment to determine function/biological activity would require undue experimentation, absent guidance.

III. Presence or absence of working examples:

The working example provided do not rectify the deficiency as adequate support has not been provided for all the fragments encompassed by the claims. Therefore, it is difficult to ascertain the nature of the claimed invention from the example provided.

IV. Nature of the Invention:

The nature of the invention is an isolated nucleic acid fragment encoding a protein said to have 66% sequence identity to a sugar transport protein (see claim 16 for example). The art recognizes that sequence identity is insufficient to bestow function and based on the variability contemplated, retention of the specific biological activity is unpredictable.

V. Predictability or Unpredictability:

Predictability of which potential changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (for example, expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, for example, multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been provided in the specification. Therefore, while it is known in the art that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited, as certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship. It is also known in the art that a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many cases. For example, various sites or regions directly involved in binding activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites can be affected (see Wells, Biochemistry, vol. 29, pages 8509-8517, 1990). The instant specification provides no

guidance/direction as to which regions of the protein would be tolerant of modifications and which would not, and it provides no working examples of any variant sequence that is encompassed by the claims. It is in no way predictable that randomly selected mutations, such as deletions, substitutions, additions, etc., in the disclosed sequences would result in a protein having activity comparable to the one disclosed. As plural substitutions for example are introduced, their interactions with each other and their effects on the structure and function of the protein is unpredictable. The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all the fragments/variants encompassed in the claims would retain the recited function.

## VI. State of the Prior Art

The state of the prior art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability as stated above. Seffernick et al. (*J. Bacteriology*, vol. 183, pages 2405-2410, 2001) disclose two polypeptides having 98% sequence identity and 99% sequence identity, differing at only 9 out of 475 amino acids (page 2407, right column, middle and page 2408, Fig. 3). The polypeptides of Seffernick et al. are identical along relatively long stretches of their respective sequences (page 2408, Fig. 3), however, these polypeptides exhibit distinct functions. The modifications exemplified in the Seffernick et al. reference is small compared to those contemplated and encompassed by the claimed invention.

Additionally, the state of the prior art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability in obtaining desired or expected phenotypes following plant transformation with genes encoding proteins, particularly when genes from one plant source are introduced into a plant of a different source. For example, Kull et al. (*J. Genet. And Breed.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pages

69-76, 1995) found that antisense GBSSI (granule-bound starch synthase) sequences from barley had no effect on the degree of branching of starch produced by potato plants transformed therewith (see page 69, Abstract). Further, the art recognizes that even when a plant is transformed from a certain species, with a gene from the same species, the desired phenotypic change might not result (see Kossmann et al., Progress in Biotechnology, vol. 10, pages 271-278, 1995). Therefore, the variability contemplated in the claimed invention might not result in a sugar transport protein having the characteristics of *beta-vulgaris*.

#### VII. Breadth of the claims:

The breadth of the claims are very broad and encompass any fragment of the claimed sequence. The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claims, which encompass an unspecified amount of fragments. The issue in this case is the breath of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Thus, for all these reasons, the specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

7. No claims are presently allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MS

Patent Examiner

HOPE ROBINSON  
PATENT EXAMINER

8/23/05